

offices and believe this section would assist States to disseminate anti-fraud related material following the declaration of a disaster by the President.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in enacting this legislation.●

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AT 50

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, 50 years ago this week in San Francisco, the U.N. Charter was opened for signature. After some 9 weeks of negotiations, as World War II was drawing to a close, representatives from 50 countries unanimously adopted the charter. On the 24th of October 1945, the charter came into force, and the United Nations was effectively born.

During this, the 50th anniversary year of the United Nations, I am deeply concerned that, rather than celebrating its endurance, we are witnessing a disturbing series of attacks upon it. Ironically, these attacks come at a challenging time for the United Nations. For now, with the end of the cold war, the United Nations has a genuine opportunity to function as it was intended to at the end of World War II.

For many years, a constant Soviet veto in the Security Council effectively neutralized the United Nations. Between 1946 and 1970, for example, the Soviet Union vetoed Security Council actions more than 100 times before the United States even cast its first veto.

But the United States chose to persevere within the existing U.N. framework. Even when casting their votes in 1945 to support ratification of the U.N. Charter, Senators recognized the challenging agenda faced by the United Nations in the years ahead. Senator Mead, a Democrat from New York, offered the following admonition:

The Charter is not a key to utopia. Words written upon paper have no power in and of themselves to alter the course of events. It is only the spirit of men and nations behind those words which can do that.

Today we continue to face the question: What kind of spirit do we wish to guide our discussion of the United Nations in 1995?

There are two sharply contrasting directions in which our discussion of the United Nations can proceed. One is tantamount to withdrawing U.S. support from the United Nations by constantly searching out ways of undermining and weakening the institution. Unfortunately there are legislative proposals before this Congress which would move in this direction. Alternatively, we could apply our energies toward ensuring that the United States plays a key role in reforming and strengthening the United Nations as we prepare to enter a new century. I strongly believe that the hope of building a peaceful and prosperous world lies in choosing the latter course.

There have been times in our history when Americans believed that we could go it alone and simply ignore conflicts and problems originating in other parts

of the world. Indeed, isolationist sentiment succeeded in preventing the United States from joining the League of Nations at the end of World War I, despite the fact that President Woodrow Wilson was its leading architect.

Those who labored in San Francisco and elsewhere to create the United Nations half a century ago learned from the mistakes of their predecessors with respect to the League of Nations. Parties to the initial negotiations at Dumbarton Oaks on establishing a United Nations, and to later preparations in San Francisco, insisted, for example, that the U.N. organization recognize the reality of great powers by granting significant authority to a Security Council. In that Council, the United States and other major powers were given the veto power—thereby ensuring that the United Nations could not undertake operations which United States opposed. In recognition of the leadership role taken by the United States in building the United Nations, New York was later chosen to serve as U.N. headquarters.

Ensuring responsible U.S. engagement within the United Nations in 1995 remains nearly as demanding as in 1945. Much of the advice offered by Senator Gurney, a Republican from South Dakota, to his Senate colleagues in 1945 rings true today:

... let me caution that after our almost unanimous vote for the Charter today we cannot merely sit back and feel and say, "Everything is fixed now, everyone is safe." No; our people are entitled by their sacrifices in this war and others to more than that. We and all other nations must give the Charter organization the all-out support of all our people—sincere, honest support, continuing for years to come—in order that this world organization may be a growing, living instrumentality, capable of handling world problems in a fair and effective way.

Even as we mark the United Nation's first 50 years, we must look to the challenges of a new century. In past decades, others designed the United Nations, drafted the charter, passed the enabling legislation, and persevered throughout the cold war. The task facing us in this decade is to assist the United Nations to adapt to the end of the cold war and to a new century. The need for a United Nations remains clear, for, as Madeleine Albright, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, has commented:

The battle-hardened generation of Roosevelt, Churchill and De Gaulle viewed the U.N. as a practical response to an inherently contentious world; a necessity not because relations among states could ever be brought into perfect harmony, but because they cannot.

This sense of realism seems absent from many of the current discussions of the United Nations. While many rail about the deficiencies of the United Nations, they have not proposed a viable alternative to the United Nations. If we look back at the debate 50 years ago, we see that Senators recognized the necessity of U.N. membership partly because they acknowledged the absence of an alternative.

While the United Nations work for peace and prosperity has never been easy, current challenges to peace have grown more complex partly because the nature of the conflicts the United Nations is asked to address has changed. Complex interethnic conflicts are resurfacing after having been suppressed. Guerrilla warfare is increasingly conducted by warring factions who do not respond to political or economic pressure. Conflict is frequently within borders and involves militias and armed civilians who lack discipline and clear chains of command. Disputes often take place without clear front lines. The fact that combatants often target civilians leads to increasing numbers both of displaced persons and refugees.

In an effort to address such conflicts, the United Nations has expanded its operational responsibilities. As a result, U.N. peacekeeping missions have been deployed in places like Somalia or Rwanda where personnel must grapple with the fact that no effective state structure exists. In many trouble spots, the police and judiciary have collapsed, and general banditry and chaos prevail. Government assets have been destroyed and stolen; experienced officials have been killed or forced to flee the country. These realities are forcing the U.N. personnel to reconsider their terms of reference and to grapple with inadequate mandates. The truth is that the United Nations has been asked to handle some of the most uncertain, intractable, and dangerous cases of conflict.

Clearly, the United Nations must be practical about the limits of its peacekeeping and must not undertake efforts that will drain U.N. resources without achieving the mission's goals. It is frustrating not to be able to resolve all the many conflicts on the international agenda, but do we abandon the United Nations if it cannot completely and successfully solve every problem in our world? Few institutions dealing with such complex matters (or for that matter much simpler ones) have 100-percent success records.

In 1945, President Truman made an observation that is relevant to the current examination of U.N. peacekeeping efforts. He said,

Building a peace requires as much moral stamina as waging a war. Perhaps it requires even more, because it is so laborious and painstaking and undramatic. It requires undying patience and continuous application. But it can give us, if we stay with it, the greatest reward that there is in the whole field of human effort.

I believe Americans recognize the wisdom of President Truman's words and want to do their part; the United Nations is one means by which they can do so.

While U.N. peacekeeping has recently been the focus of attention, much of the United Nations work takes place in other areas. Less in the spotlight are the steadfast efforts of U.N. agencies

working to alleviate poverty, to slow the spread of HIV/A.I.D.S., and to feed and educate the world's children. Where conflict leads to destabilization of families and societies, the United Nations is there to shelter and feed refugees and displaced persons. Progress made on upholding international norms on human rights also stems from the work of U.N. agencies. Finally, the United Nations is responsible for many of the gains made in reducing the use of ozone-depleting substances, evaluating environmental impacts, and conserving biological diversity. These are but a few of the challenges facing the world today. Many of these problems have effects that do not respect national or geographic borders, and the United Nations offers a coherent and coordinated approach for meeting such challenges.

Mr. President, whether Americans feel the responsibility of exercising global leadership, are responding to humanitarian concerns, or seeking to expand opportunities for international trade and commerce, the United Nations offers us a critical world forum. To cripple the United Nations by an erosion or withdrawal of American participation would be a terrible mistake. The United Nations provides the institutional means for leveraging American diplomatic, economic, and military resources in ways that enhance our vital National interests. Opinion surveys consistently indicate that a solid majority of the American people recognize the positive role that the United Nations can play. I hope such recognition of the United Nations value and importance will be demonstrated when the Senate considers U.S. participation in and support for the United Nations. Let us heed the words of warning offered by President Truman in 1945: "The immediate, the greatest threat to us is the threat of disillusionment, the danger of insidious skepticism—a loss of faith in the effectiveness of international cooperation."●

#### ONE HUNDRED YEARS IN HARDWARE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, my hearty congratulations to the Michigan Retail Hardware Association on its 100th anniversary. This fine organization has been serving the hardware, home center, and lumber industry since July 9, 1895, when it was founded in Detroit. In reaching this milestone, they have weathered the years, surviving wars and depression, growing to be a robust and vigorous organization.

The backbone of this association is in the ranks of the hundreds of small business men and women who stand behind those hardware store counters each day, ready to serve their customers with a smile and a helping hand. Those weekend chores we all face, to fix up or cleanup our homesteads, becomes a pleasant endeavor after that cheerful visit to the neighborhood hardware store.

Over the years business leaders in this enterprise have come together and prospered, exercising that grand democratic tradition of flexing their common interests and gathering strength in numbers. By coming together, the members of the Michigan Retail Hardware Association make our communities and our economy solid, the skills of managers and workers are fortified, and camaraderie and good fellowship grows.

The trip to the hardware store has become a valued ritual for American families as they labor to make improvements on hearth and home. As we build and fix and sand and paint, we look to our hardware centers to give us the tools and gadgets we need to make our lives more comfortable and bright. For me, the nostalgia of the hardware store is that no small town in America really seems complete without a hardware store plunked down in the middle of Main Street.

My best wishes for this business group on the centennial anniversary of their founding. My best hopes for many more additional years of productivity ahead.●

#### HOUSE CUTS CRIME-FIGHTING DOLLARS

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise to offer my strong opposition to actions taken by the House Commerce/State/Justice Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this week. In passing the 1996 appropriation's bill the subcommittee Republicans have set off on a course which would cripple Federal, State, and local efforts to combat crime. If the subcommittee Republicans' plan is adopted: New FBI agents will not be hired; 20,000 State and local police will not be hired; thousands of wife-beaters will not be arrested, tried or convicted; new DEA agents will not be hired; 80,000 offenders released on probation will not be tested for drugs or subject to certain punishment; and digital telephony technology vital to law enforcement will not be developed.

First, let me address the cuts to Federal law enforcement. The President requested an increase of \$122 million for FBI agents and other FBI activities—but the subcommittee Republicans cut \$45 million from that request.

I would also point out that the subcommittee Republicans provides no dollars of the \$300 million authorized for FBI in the Dole/Hatch counter-terrorism bill. This legislation has not passed into law, so some might say that is the reason that none of these dollars are made available. But, the subcommittee Republicans did find a way to add their block grant which passed the House, but not the Senate.

So, I do not think there is any explanation for cutting the FBI other than a fundamental lack of commitment to Federal law enforcement by the subcommittee Republicans. I have heard time and again over the past several

months from my Republican colleagues in the Senate that the President was not committed to Federal law enforcement. I have heard time and again from my Republican colleagues that they would increase funding for Federal law enforcement.

Well, something just does not add up—House subcommittee Republicans will not give the President the increase he requested for the FBI, despite all the rhetoric I have heard over the past several months.

The cuts to Federal law enforcement do not even stop there. The House subcommittee Republicans cut \$17 million from the \$54 million boost requested for DEA agents by the administration. That is more than a 30-percent cut. The House subcommittee Republicans provide no dollars of the \$60 million authorized for DEA in the Dole/Hatch counterterrorism bill.

Let me review another area where the actions of these subcommittee Republicans are completely opposite the rhetoric I have heard from the other side here in the Senate.

The Violence Against Women Act—having first introduced the Violence Against Women Act 5 years ago, I had welcomed the bipartisan support finally accorded the act last year. I would note the strong support provided by Senators HATCH and DOLE.

But, when we have gotten past the rhetoric and it came time to actually write the check in the Appropriations Subcommittee, the women of America were mugged. The President requested \$175 million for the Justice Department's violence against women programs, and the House subcommittee Republicans have provided less than half—\$75 million.

While the specific programs have not been yet identified, that \$100 million will mean the key initiatives will not get the funding that everyone on both sides of the aisle agreed they should: \$130 million was requested for grants to State and local police, prosecutors and victims groups; \$28 million was requested to make sure that every man who beats his wife or girlfriend is arrested; \$7 million was requested for enforcement efforts against family violence and child abuse in rural areas; and \$6 million was requested to provide special advocates for abused children who come before a court.

I keep hearing about how the Violence Against Women Act is a bipartisan effort. In all the new so-called crime bills I have seen proposed by Members of the other side, not once have I seen any effort to repeal or cut back on any element of the Violence Against Women Act. But, the actions of the House subcommittee Republicans tell a completely different story.

To discuss yet another troubling aspect of the House subcommittee Republican bill—this bill eliminates the \$1.9 billion sought for the second year of the 100,000 police program. That \$1.9